

REMARKS

Claims 1-15, 17, 19-21, 46-54 and 70 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15 and 70 are allowed.

Claims 21, 46, 48, and 49 are rejected.

Claims 7, 10, 13, 14, 17, 19, and 20 are withdrawn but would be rejoined at the time the application is allowable.

Claims 47 and 50-54 are objected to but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants have cancelled claim 47 and amended claim 46 to include all of the limitations recited in claim 47. As amended, independent claim 46 is allowable. Claims 50-54 depend from claim 46 are allowable for the same reasons as claim 46.

Claim 48 has been amended to more definitely claim the invention. Support for the amendment can be found in the specification at par. 0016.

35 U.S.C. 112 Rejections

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, par. 1 on the ground that there was no support for the limitations: “determining the maximum limits of each of said plurality of operating parameters”; “providing said determined maximum and minimum limits to the vehicle controller”; and “preventing said determined maximum and minimum limits from being exceeded in the aeronautical vehicle by the vehicle controller”. (Office Action, p. 2) Applicants respectfully disagree. Support for the foregoing limitations can be found in pars. 0014-0025 of the specification and in particulars, pars. 0021-0025.

Claims 48 was rejected under par. 2 of 35 U.S.C. § 112 par. 2. (Office Action, p. 3) As amended, claim 48 overcomes this rejection and is now allowable.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejections

Claims 46, 48, and 49 were rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0151672A1 ("Augustin"). (Office Action, p. 3)

The Examiner stated that claim 47 was allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim (*i.e.*, claim 46) and any intervening claims. (Office Action, p. 5) Independent claim 46 has been amended to recite all of the limitations recited in claim 47. Amended claim 46 is now allowable. Claims 48 and 49 depend from claim 46 and are allowable for the same reasons that claim 46 is allowable.

In view of the foregoing, the rejection of claims 46, 48 and 49 is moot. Nevertheless, Applicants would like to take this opportunity to point out to the Examiner that unlike Applicants' invention, Augustin does not disclose, teach or suggest determining at least one vertical inceptor position to maintain a vertical state. Neither does Augustin disclose, teach or suggest any method of cueing a vehicle operator of maximum accelerations and decelerations that may be performed during a constant vertical state without disengagement therefrom. Augustin is directed solely to tactile cueing of aircraft control systems to alert pilots of approaching limits on certain aircraft parameters such as engine torque, rotor speed and engine temperature. (Augustin, Abstract and pars. 00001 and 0013) without any reference to maintaining constant a vertical state at the same time.

Withdrawn Claims

The Examiner acknowledged that claim 1 was generic. Previously amended claim 1 remains generic. Therefore, withdrawn claims 7, 10, 13, 14, 17, 19 and 20 depending from claim 1, should be allowable. Applicants request that the status of claims 7, 10, 13, 14, 17, 19 and 20 be amended from “withdrawn” to “allowed”.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that claims 1-15, 17, 19-21, 46-54 and 70 are allowable and in a proper condition for allowance. Should any issue remain to be resolved, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully Submitted,
Attorney for Applicant

Dated: March 26, 2008

/joshua s. broitman/
Joshua S. Broitman
Registration No. 38,006
OSTRAGER CHONG FLAHERTY AND
BROITMAN, PC
570 Lexington Avenue, 17th Floor
New York, NY 10022-6894
Phone: (212) 681-0600
Customer Number: 64722